

## Short-Term Rental Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments

STR Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments for 12-18-2019 Joint STRRB and County Council Work Session					
Public Comment Ref. #	Topic-Public Comment	Summary of Public Comments/Recommendation	STRRB Ref #	Potential Changes in Policy or Guidance/ Staff Comments	Council Comments
Public Comments Associated with STRRB Recommendations					
	Definition of Resident Agent	<p>Steen (58) – Clarify role of the RA.</p> <p>MSBR (50) – Agrees with Board.</p> <p>TVA(16,20,56,78) - Hotline should be primary contact, not RA. RA does not need enforcement obligations, define as “the person or organization who represents a property owner during his/her absence while a paying guest is in the property.”</p>	1	<p>See page 2 &amp; 3 STRRB matrix response.</p> <p>The resident agent is acting on behalf of the property owner and is required to ensure the property is operated in compliance with the Code and license conditions.</p>	
	Change of Resident Agent	<p>MSBR (50) – Agrees with Board.</p> <p>TVA(16,20,56,78) - Agree</p>	2	See page 3 STRRB matrix response.	
	Add requirement for a carbon monoxide detector	<p>Haase (33) – Supports requiring Carbon Monoxide detectors in STRs.</p> <p>MSBR (50) – Agrees with Board (if dwelling contains fuel burning equipment).</p> <p>TVA(16,20,56,78) - Agree, if source/risk exists (i.e. not totally electric homes).</p>	3	See page 6 STRRB matrix response.	
	When new applications may be filed	<p>Bogan (12) – Allow submittal throughout the year.</p> <p>ESVR (6) - Accept applications any time of year.</p> <p>MSBR (50) – Agrees with Board.</p> <p>TVA(16,20,56,78) – Agree with Board recommendation any time of year.</p>	4	See page 3 STRRB matrix response.	

STR Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments for 12-18-2019 Joint STRRB and County Council Work Session					
Public Comment Ref. #	Topic-Public Comment	Summary of Public Comments/Recommendation	STRRB Ref #	Potential Changes in Policy or Guidance/ Staff Comments	Council Comments
	Who receives notice/private road	MSBR (50) – Agrees with Board.  TVA(16,20,56,78) – Agree.	5	See page 3 STRRB matrix response.	
	Concerns were raised by several (citizens) related to STR renters not properly using private roads.	MSBR (50) – Agree with Board.  TVA(16,20,56,78) - Private roads: rules vary for individual roads, each deed may be different, ask Council to draft and County Attorney to provide clarification, agree to add provisions on how to be a good neighbor.	6	See page 1 STRRB matrix response.	
	Number of Notices for New Application and Method of Mailing Notice	Bogan (12) – Only one mailing to neighbors within 500’ of STR.  Miller (53) - Letters at \$6.80 a piece, sent twice = over \$700 in mailings, half returned unopen. Sign, digital notice on webpage or newspaper.  Carney (14) - Mailing redundant, return receipt not necessary.  Hardesty (15) - Concern with cost of multitude of certified mailings.  Haase (33) – Agrees with one notice but should be 31 vs. 21 days.  Snyder (37) – If notice reduced to one, require verification of delivery confirmations within 5 days of hearing.  MSBR (50) – Agrees with Board.	7 & 8	See page 3 & 4 STRRB matrix response.	

STR Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments for 12-18-2019 Joint STRRB and County Council Work Session					
Public Comment Ref. #	Topic-Public Comment	Summary of Public Comments/Recommendation	STRRB Ref #	Potential Changes in Policy or Guidance/ Staff Comments	Council Comments
	Cont' Number of Notices for New Application and Method of Mailing Notice	<p>Steen (58) – Strengthen notice provisions.</p> <p>McCafferty (61) – Waste of time, money and paper, no reason to require delivery confirmation.</p> <p>TVA(16,20,56,78) - Agree to one notice, concerns about 21 day window and when it starts, object to publishing contact info for applicants, suggest US First Class mail with certificate of mailing.</p>			
	Allow inspections to be done before filing a new application.	<p>MSBR (50) – Agrees with Board.</p> <p>TVA(16,20,56,78) - Agree.</p>	9	See page 4 STRRB matrix response.	
	Clarify that third-party IRC inspections are allowed for new applications.	<p>MSBR (50) – Agrees with Board.</p> <p>TVA(16,20,56,78) - Agree.</p>	10	See page 4 STRRB matrix response.	
	Allow third-party inspections for potable water and sanitary facilities.	<p>MSBR (50) – Agrees with Board.</p> <p>TVA(16,20,56,78) - Agree.</p>	11	See page 5 STRRB matrix response.	
	Add a requirement that all STR advertising must be consistent with the parameters of the law, license and house rules.	<p>DeMarco (63) – Support, provides clarity to renters.</p> <p>MSBR (50) – Disagree with inclusion of House Rules in advertising, license holder/agent to send Rules to renters.</p> <p>TVA(16,20,56,78) - How will this be enforced and at what cost? Redundant, perhaps selected House Rules included</p>	12	<p>See page 5 STRRB matrix response.</p> <p>Needs to be in compliance with rules and regulations but does not need to include them within advertisements.</p>	

STR Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments for 12-18-2019 Joint STRRB and County Council Work Session					
Public Comment Ref. #	Topic-Public Comment	Summary of Public Comments/Recommendation	STRRB Ref #	Potential Changes in Policy or Guidance/ Staff Comments	Council Comments
		(max capacity).			
	Correct errors or inconsistencies	<p>MSBR (50) – Agrees with Board.</p> <p>TVA(16,20,56,78) - Objections to content of the Code, not these particular changes, objections noted elsewhere.</p>	13	See page 5 STRRB matrix response.	
	Clarify that the per bedroom occupancy requirement also applies to accessory dwellings that are rented.	<p>MSBR (50) – Agrees with Board.</p> <p>TVA(16,20,56,78) - Agree, but disagree in concept to per bedroom occupancy requirement.</p>	14	See page 5 STRRB matrix response.	
	Require Owner to be present at new application hearings.	<p>duPont (36) – Opportunity to meet the neighbors, require owner to be present except under exigent circumstances.</p> <p>MSBR (50) – Agrees with Board, if allowance for owner to be present by phone.</p> <p>TVA(16,20,56,78) - Who determines what is an “unusual circumstance”, not unreasonable to participate by phone, if owner sends a proxy, it could be at their own risk.</p>	15	See page 6 STRRB matrix response.	
	Improve information on complaints provided to citizens.	<p>Kimbis (28) – Warning against personally-identifiable information on public-facing websites.</p>	16	See page 1 STRRB matrix response.	

STR Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments for 12-18-2019 Joint STRRB and County Council Work Session					
Public Comment Ref. #	Topic-Public Comment	Summary of Public Comments/Recommendation	STRRB Ref #	Potential Changes in Policy or Guidance/ Staff Comments	Council Comments
		<p><b>MSBR (50)</b> – Agrees with Board.</p> <p><b>Steen (58)</b> – Make more user friendly, but change so not relying on citizens to assure enforcement of the law, inform STR Board of all complaints and allow them to evaluate such complaints.</p> <p><b>Hogan (75)</b> – Publicize compliant phone number and create online complaint form, Educate on definition of harassment and illegal audiotaping/ unauthorized photos of minors, use of private roads and shared driveways (visitors allowed usually) (including Office of Law training on such topics).</p> <p><b>TVA(16,20,56,78)</b> - Support sharing information and methods for citizens to log complaints, allow guests to report neighbor harassment so records can be kept, have offending neighbors sign a form defining laws on harassment, illegal photography, that private roads with more than one residence are not private, etc.</p>			
	<b>Maintain a list of STR violations for citizens to be able to access.</b>	<p><b>Snyder (37)</b> – Hearing, decision, complaints, violations, renewal applicant, names, addresses, resident agent name on County website. Transparency.</p> <p><b>MSBR (50)</b> – Disagrees with Board. No other license holder subject to provision.</p>	17	See page 1 STRRB matrix response.	

STR Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments for 12-18-2019 Joint STRRB and County Council Work Session					
Public Comment Ref. #	Topic-Public Comment	Summary of Public Comments/Recommendation	STRRB Ref #	Potential Changes in Policy or Guidance/ Staff Comments	Council Comments
		<p><b>Steen (58)</b> – All complaints should be available to citizens and on the County website.</p> <p><b>TVA(16,20,56,78)</b> - Concerns re privacy, liability, funding for this request, not required for other County licenses.</p>			
	Distribute House Rules more expansively.	<p><b>MSBR (50)</b> – Agrees with Board.</p> <p><b>TVA(16,20,56,78)</b> - Agree.</p>	18	See page 1 STRRB matrix response.	
	Create summary to be provided to new licensees about next steps and parameters for compliance.	<p><b>MSBR (50)</b> – Agrees with Board.</p> <p><b>TVA(16,20,56,78)</b> - Unnecessary, who will fund, include in application if done.</p>	19	See page 2 STRRB matrix response.	
	Provide STR data to the public on the County website.	<p><b>Steen (58)</b> – All information about STRs should be on the County website (licensing and complaints).</p> <p><b>MSBR (50)</b> – No reason for this, no other license holder required to publically display personal information.</p> <p><b>TVA(16,20,56,78)</b> - Oppose, how funded, privacy concerns, vacant homes robbed, standard for other licenses?</p>	20	See page 2 STRRB matrix response.	
	Only one lease per rental.	<p><b>MSBR (50)</b> – Agrees with Board.</p> <p><b>TVA(16,20,56,78)</b> - Agree.</p>	21	See page 6 STRRB matrix response.	

STR Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments for 12-18-2019 Joint STRRB and County Council Work Session					
Public Comment Ref. #	Topic-Public Comment	Summary of Public Comments/Recommendation	STRRB Ref #	Potential Changes in Policy or Guidance/ Staff Comments	Council Comments
	Change the type of sign posted by County Staff before a Board Hearing.	<p>Haase (33) – Supports sign stating STR pending.</p> <p>Snyder (37) –STR on signs posted.</p> <p>MSBR (50) – Strongly disagree, no need for special signs.</p> <p>TVA(16,20,56,78) - Unnecessary, how funded, posting of sign redundant and possibly allows robbery of vacant home.</p>	22	See page 2 STRRB matrix response.	
	Complete applications	<p>MSBR (50) – Agrees with Board. Approval may be “pending rectification of deficiencies”.</p> <p>TVA(16,20,56,78) - Applicants need to know if they will be approved before completing costly repairs (allow conditional approvals).</p>	23	See page 7 STRRB matrix response.	
	Moratorium	<p>MSBR (50) – Strongly disagrees. Small number of unregistered STRs, policies in place to monitor for violations.</p> <p>TVA(16,20,56,78) - Where is line for purview of Board?</p>	24.a	See page 7 STRRB matrix response.	
	Disallow short-term rentals except in the owner’s principal residence	<p>Pace (2) - Interests of home owners vs. commercial interests, 706 Riverview Terrace is not a proper location for a STR.</p> <p>Lewis (49) – Advocate for STRs in principal residences only.</p> <p>MSBR (50) – Extensively debated and</p>	24.b.	See page 7 STRRB matrix response.	



STR Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments for 12-18-2019 Joint STRRB and County Council Work Session					
Public Comment Ref. #	Topic-Public Comment	Summary of Public Comments/Recommendation	STRRB Ref #	Potential Changes in Policy or Guidance/ Staff Comments	Council Comments
		<p>determined no difference between owner occupied or second homes. No indication of non-Talbot County property owner less civically responsible.</p> <p><b>Bollman (71)</b> - Limit new applications to resident-occupied properties, grandfather current licenses.</p> <p><b>Wetmore (80)</b> - Only allow licenses for residents of the County.</p> <p><b>TVA(16,20,56,78)</b> - Disagree.</p>			
	<p><b>Change version of the Building Code.</b></p> <p><b>And</b></p> <p><b>Allow grandfathering of Building Code.</b></p>	<p><b>Weinstein (1)</b> - Waiver for noncompliant stairwells, ability to rent through waiver process.</p> <p><b>ESVR (6)</b> - Grandfather date of construction for homes before 2003.</p> <p><b>Hardesty (7)</b> - Window size and staircase not meeting 2003 building code.</p> <p><b>Hamilton (10)</b> - Stairs in historic home not in compliance with 2003 code.</p> <p><b>Carney (11)</b> - Properties permitted when built.</p> <p><b>Watts/Monroe (13)</b> - Waiver or variance for historic structures. B&amp;B's, Inns not required to comply with safety codes.</p>	24.c & d	<p>See page 7 STRRB matrix response.</p> <p>If provisions are granted for previously constructed homes, additional conditions to mitigate may include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Notation in all leases that state inconsistencies with the current building requirements.</li> <li>2. Requirement for all occupants to sign acknowledgement of inconsistencies.</li> <li>3. Require automatic lighting connected to smoke/fire alarm system in area of deficiency (low, narrow stairwells) and/or signage for low clearance.</li> <li>4. Certification/proof of listing from State or County for historic homes.</li> </ol>	



STR Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments for 12-18-2019 Joint STRRB and County Council Work Session					
Public Comment Ref. #	Topic-Public Comment	Summary of Public Comments/Recommendation	STRRB Ref #	Potential Changes in Policy or Guidance/ Staff Comments	Council Comments
	<p><b>Cont’</b> <b>Change version of the Building Code.</b></p> <p><b>And</b></p> <p><b>Allow grandfathering of Building Code.</b></p>	<p><b>Hardesty (15)</b> - Concern with application of 2003 building code.</p> <p><b>Perdue (19)</b> - Negative implications of current fire code (1950’s home).</p> <p><b>Kimbis (28)</b> – Arbitrary assignment of 2003 Code on houses of all ages.</p> <p><b>McGlannan (32)</b> – Size of windows- government interference in homeowner rights.</p> <p><b>Haase (33)</b> – Advises not to change egress and safety requirements for various listed reasons.</p> <p><b>duPont (36)</b> – Previously signed an affidavit in compliance, not a change in Code, change in enforcement. Cost of doing business.</p> <p><b>Stumpf (38)</b> - Lack of grandfathering, application of retroactive building code.</p> <p><b>McCallum (41)</b> –Significant recent investment, still failed safety inspection. No waiver or grandfathering.</p> <p><b>MSBR (50)</b> – Strongly disagrees with application of current code. Changes to structure too costly, don’t preserve historic integrity, not required in B&amp;B,</p>			

STR Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments for 12-18-2019 Joint STRRB and County Council Work Session					
Public Comment Ref. #	Topic-Public Comment	Summary of Public Comments/Recommendation	STRRB Ref #	Potential Changes in Policy or Guidance/ Staff Comments	Council Comments
	<p><b>Cont' Change version of the Building Code.</b></p> <p><b>And</b></p> <p><b>Allow grandfathering of Building Code.</b></p>	<p>motels or long term rentals, opens to application to other buildings in County.</p> <p><b>Miller (52)</b> – Why are STRs held to higher building standard then B&amp;Bs?</p> <p><b>Steen (58)</b> – Assure that STRs are safe and healthy accommodations.</p> <p><b>Cox (62)</b> – Current regulations driving people out of business, attack on tourism industry.</p> <p><b>Ebel (65)</b> – Do not allow grandfathering.</p> <p><b>Scofield (67)</b> – Change to not require mandatory retrofitting of historic buildings</p> <p><b>TVA(16,20,56,78)</b> - Homes should be held to the building code standard in place at the time they were constructed.</p>			
	<b>Treat short-term rentals the same as B&amp;B's and hotel/motels.</b>	<p><b>Bogan (12)</b> – STR industry singled out with harsh regulations that other accommodations do not need to follow.</p> <p><b>Hines (35)</b> – Costs and regulatory burden for STRs comparable to B&amp;Bs and hotels.</p> <p><b>Stumpf (38)</b> – Treat entire rental community the same. STRs same as B&amp;B.</p> <p><b>Ebel (65)</b> – Treat STRs in the same manner as other transient accommodations</p>	24.e	See page 8 STRRB matrix response.	

STR Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments for 12-18-2019 Joint STRRB and County Council Work Session					
Public Comment Ref. #	Topic-Public Comment	Summary of Public Comments/Recommendation	STRRB Ref #	Potential Changes in Policy or Guidance/ Staff Comments	Council Comments
		(zoning, occupancy rules, and liquor control).  <b>Scofield (82)</b> – Treat STRs the same as B&Bs.			
<b>New public comments for Council consideration</b>					
1	<b>New Application Process</b>	<p><b>Miller (3)</b> - Process lengthy, requiring significant amount of paperwork, scan documents.</p> <p><b>Hardesty (7)</b> - Procedures and requirements incredibly burdensome. Large amount of paperwork.</p> <p><b>Carney (11)</b> - Cumbersome, stacks of paper, on-line system for applications.</p> <p><b>Talbot Vacation Advocates (TVA) (16,21,56)</b> - Many steps, incredibly long time to be given hearing date.</p> <p><b>Haase (33)</b> – Applications contain omissions and mistakes, checked thoroughly by trained staff, new permit fees could be established to cover expenses and quicken process.</p> <p><b>Snyder (37)</b> – Increase application fee, accommodation tax to pay for PZ staff and enforcement for STR program. Transparency.</p>		<p>Host Compliance will accept on-line applications. This service is expected to be up and running in January 2020.</p> <p>Hard copies still need to be made for all Board members, inspectors (EH, Building, Screening) and a file copy.</p> <p>Increased application fees could support additional staff and/or administrative services and fees associated with processing STR applications.</p>	
	<b>Cont' New Application Process</b>	<b>Schamel (68)</b> – Process unreasonable and			

STR Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments for 12-18-2019 Joint STRRB and County Council Work Session					
Public Comment Ref. #	Topic-Public Comment	Summary of Public Comments/Recommendation	STRRB Ref #	Potential Changes in Policy or Guidance/ Staff Comments	Council Comments
		<p>unmanageable, takes too long.</p> <p><b>M. Vanderzon (69)</b> – Put licensure, complaint, notification, payments online.</p> <p><b>Reichart (72)</b> – Process frustrating and expensive.</p> <p><b>TVA(56,78)</b> - Eliminate extraneous paperwork as exhibits to application (deed (already on file), site plan, etc.)</p> <p><b>Bogan (82)</b> – Process unreasonable, time consuming and overwhelming.</p>			
2	<p><b>Renewal Application Process</b></p> <p><b>Cont' Renewal Application Process</b></p>	<p><b>Bogan (12)</b> – Streamline filling process.</p> <p><b>Watts/Monroe (13)</b> - Eliminate duplicate deeds, on-line filing, public notice by mail, no sign.</p> <p><b>Snyder (37)</b> – All renewals with significant complaints and/or violations must go to STRRB vs. approved administratively.</p> <p><b>Akridge (40)</b> – Received renewal notice after 60 day cutoff. Paperwork and inspections not required in past. Notify license holders of changes in writing.</p> <p><b>Otte (42)</b> – Renewal applications subject to citizen complaint go to Board vs. administratively reviewed.</p>		<p>Moving forward these documents will be submitted electronically and attached to MUNIS. New documents would not be needed unless amendments or changes have been made during the license period.</p> <p>Planning Director has discretion to take renewals before Board. One of the listed reasons includes; “Violations of the Talbot County Code related to operation of short-term rental...”</p> <p>A “complaint” (vs. a substantiated violation) would most likely not rise to the level of deferral.</p>	



STR Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments for 12-18-2019 Joint STRRB and County Council Work Session					
Public Comment Ref. #	Topic-Public Comment	Summary of Public Comments/Recommendation	STRRB Ref #	Potential Changes in Policy or Guidance/ Staff Comments	Council Comments
		and are a commercial enterprise.  <b>Wetmore(80)</b> - STRs are businesses which is counter to permitted zoning.			
4	Screening	<b>Laura Carney (11)</b> - Screening requirement not necessary if STR owner also owns adjoining lands.  <b>McGlannan (32)</b> – Landscaping restrictions -government interference.  <b>Reichhart (72)</b> - Screening requirement should be eliminated if STR owner also owns adjoining lands.		Concern about adequacy of screening if STR lot or adjoining lot were to be sold separately.	
5	Restrictions on issuance of license	<b>ESVR (6)</b> - Language is too broad, within scope of examples vs. “without limitation”. Discretion to impose restrictions under certain circumstances.		Cannot list all restrictions that would be appropriate for each license as every property and neighborhood provide unique circumstances.	
6	Transferrable license	<b>ESVR (6)</b> - License should be transferrable.		The Board has suggested that the property owner MUST be present. If license is transferable, the new owner may not be aware of conditions, restrictions or neighborhood concerns.	
7	Modify term of license	<b>Bogan (12)</b> – Increase to five year term.  <b>Snyder (37)</b> – If every two yr vs. annual, fee should be twice as much.  <b>TVA (56,78)</b> - Increase to four year term with annual affirmation that no ownership or structural modifications have been made and no record of violations or		If license term is amended the associated fees should also be reconsidered.	

STR Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments for 12-18-2019 Joint STRRB and County Council Work Session					
Public Comment Ref. #	Topic-Public Comment	Summary of Public Comments/Recommendation	STRRB Ref #	Potential Changes in Policy or Guidance/ Staff Comments	Council Comments
		assessed penalties.			
8	Amend requirement to apply for renewal 60 days before expiration	<b>TVA(78)</b> - This shortens the period of the license and complicates the process.		A 60 day time period is required to allow time for staff to process renewal applications. It does not affect the expiration date of the license.	
9	Amend who receives notice of application	<p><b>Bogan (12)</b> – Only one mailing to neighbors within 500’ of STR.</p> <p><b>Edwards (43)</b> – Reduce 1000’ requirement.</p> <p><b>TVA(78)</b> - Only include those in line of sight, on shared roads, i.e. those directly impacted by rental activity.</p>		This may be appropriate in higher density areas, such as villages or town residential zonings where notices can reach over 100+ properties.	
10	Amend provision on maximum occupancy	<p><b>Stumpf (38)</b> – Should not set limit on the number of people that can visit during the day.</p> <p><b>Price (39)</b> – Guest not identified on rental agreement can visit but cannot stay overnight.</p> <p><b>Miller (52)</b> – Occupancy expectation may be causing County revenue loss, does not promote tourism.</p> <p><b>Ebel (65)</b> – Consider septic field requirements related to occupancy limits.</p> <p><b>Scofield (67)</b> – Don’t limit the number of “day guests”.</p>			



STR Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments for 12-18-2019 Joint STRRB and County Council Work Session					
Public Comment Ref. #	Topic-Public Comment	Summary of Public Comments/Recommendation	STRRB Ref #	Potential Changes in Policy or Guidance/ Staff Comments	Council Comments
		TVA(78) - Allow more persons than two persons per bedroom at all times to allow visitors, service people, etc., possibly based on property size and density.			
11	<p>Change three day minimum stay requirement</p> <p>Cont' Change three day minimum stay requirement</p>	<p>Kimbis (28) – Damaging/Discriminating to STRs, sends funds to hotels and B&amp;Bs.</p> <p>McGlannan (32) – Length of stay- government interference.</p> <p>Stumpf (38) – No rationale for three night minimum.</p> <p>Price (39) – Two night rental during off peak season, three night during peak.</p> <p>Akridge (40) – Three night stay not fair to STR owners, rely on 1-2 night weekend visitors.</p> <p>M. Vanderzon (69) - Reduce three night minimum to two nights.</p> <p>TVA(78) - Change to two night minimum.</p> <p>Tourism Board (81) - Amend to two night minimum.</p> <p>Scofield (67) – Change required minimum 3 day stay as requested by TVA.</p>		<p>Minimum time period was imposed to limit frequent turnovers, especially in residential areas/ neighborhoods.</p> <p>An alternative may include limiting the number of times per week a home may be rented (i.e. no more than two separate rentals per week). This will be much harder to monitor than the three day limit that can be verified by a lease.</p> <p>Or the suggestion to allow two nights during off-peak rental periods (Nov-April, except holiday weekends).</p>	
12	Increase Board responsibilities regarding complaints	Steen (58) – Board should be informed and evaluate enforcement action for all		Current provisions allow the Planning Director to take an application to the Board at their discretion.	



STR Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments for 12-18-2019 Joint STRRB and County Council Work Session					
Public Comment Ref. #	Topic-Public Comment	Summary of Public Comments/Recommendation	STRRB Ref #	Potential Changes in Policy or Guidance/ Staff Comments	Council Comments
		<p>responsibilities.</p> <p><b>Lytle(70)</b> – Felt bullied by neighbors by unsubstantiated concerns.</p> <p><b>Hogan(75)</b> – Questions purpose of STRRB Board, inappropriate questions to applicants, allows neighbors to “hijack” proceedings.</p> <p><b>TVA(78)</b> - Eliminate Board, reduces overall administrative costs, hearings have become forum for “invasive questioning and irrelevant conversations”.</p> <p><b>duPont(77)</b> - Supports how the STRRB has held hearings and handled public comments.</p>			
14	Support for TVA comments	<p><b>TowJammMarine-Gilmer (18)</b> - Supports TVA, STR good for businesses.</p> <p><b>McKinnon (23)</b> - Supports efforts of TVA.</p> <p><b>White (25)</b> – Supports TVA.</p> <p><b>Kodis (26)</b> – Supports TVA.</p> <p><b>Hopper (27)</b> – Supports TVA.</p> <p><b>Kimbis (28)</b> – Endorses TVA.</p> <p><b>Berg (29)</b> – Supports TVA.</p>			

STR Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments for 12-18-2019 Joint STRRB and County Council Work Session					
Public Comment Ref. #	Topic-Public Comment	Summary of Public Comments/Recommendation	STRRB Ref #	Potential Changes in Policy or Guidance/ Staff Comments	Council Comments
	Cont' Support for TVA comments	<p><b>Johnson (31)</b> – Supports TVA.</p> <p><b>McGlannon (32)</b> – Side with TVA, equal voice to positive experiences.</p> <p><b>Hines (35)</b> – Supports TVA.</p> <p><b>McCallum (41)</b> – Supports TVA.</p> <p><b>Edwards (43)</b> – Supports TVA.</p> <p><b>Johnston (44)</b> – Supports TVA.</p> <p><b>Massie (45)</b> – Supports TVA.</p> <p><b>Hayden (46)</b> – Supports short-term rentals and work with TVA.</p> <p><b>Miller (52)</b> – Two of founding members and supporters of TVA. Fear and misinformation of a few “concerned citizens”, criticized and harassed as STR applicants, service providers.</p> <p><b>Hudson (53)</b> – Supports TVA.</p> <p><b>M. McHugh (55)</b> – Member of TVA. Looking forward to improving STR process.</p> <p><b>Stevens (57)</b> – Supports TVA, STRs are the wave of the future.</p> <p><b>McCafferty (61)</b> – Supports TVA and fight</p>			

STR Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments for 12-18-2019 Joint STRRB and County Council Work Session					
Public Comment Ref. #	Topic-Public Comment	Summary of Public Comments/Recommendation	STRRB Ref #	Potential Changes in Policy or Guidance/ Staff Comments	Council Comments
		<p>for equality for STRs, reduce regulations.</p> <p><b>Cox (62)</b> – Supports TVA proposals, reasonable to allow small business to continue to operate.</p> <p><b>Scofield (67)</b> – Supports TVA.</p> <p><b>M. Vanderzon (69)</b> - STRs support local economy by employing many service providers.</p> <p><b>Lytle (70)</b> - Supports efforts of TVA, make regulations less strict.</p> <p><b>Hogan (75)</b> – Supports efforts of TVA.</p> <p><b>Morgan (76)</b> – Supports efforts of TVA, make regulations less strict.</p> <p><b>Bogan (82)</b> – Supports TVA.</p>			
15	Support for STRRB recommendations	<p><b>duPont (36)</b> – Prompt application of a majority of the recommendations.</p> <p><b>Price (39)</b> – Endorses STRRB recommendations.</p> <p><b>Otte (42)</b> – STRRB recommendations thoughtful and reasonable.</p> <p><b>Susman (47)</b> – Supports hard work of Board and Chairman.</p>			

STR Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments for 12-18-2019 Joint STRRB and County Council Work Session					
Public Comment Ref. #	Topic-Public Comment	Summary of Public Comments/Recommendation	STRRB Ref #	Potential Changes in Policy or Guidance/ Staff Comments	Council Comments
	Cont' Support for STRRB recommendations	<p><b>Sewell (48)</b> – Support the STRRB.</p> <p><b>Lewis (49)</b> – Supports STRRB recommendations.</p> <p><b>Rio Vista Comm Asso-Davis (54)</b> – Supports STRRB recommendations, safety and quality of life.</p> <p><b>Steen (58)</b> – Implement STRRB recommendations.</p> <p><b>DeMarco (63)</b> – Support STRRB recommendations - will make the process more streamlined and clean up issues that were unclear.</p> <p><b>Bollman (71)</b> - Supports STRRB recommendations to Council.</p> <p><b>Wetmore (80)</b> - Support STRRB recommendations to Council.</p>			
16	Impacts on economy, tourism, etc.	<p><b>Hardesty (7)</b> - Without STRs purchase may not be viable option. Tax revenue, tourism dollars, economic benefit.</p> <p><b>Watts/Monroe (13)</b> - Never heard firsthand of issue w/vacation rental. Vital to economy.</p> <p><b>B. McHugh (24)</b> – Retirement home, positive economic impact, service opportunities, visitors, continue to allow,</p>			

STR Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments for 12-18-2019 Joint STRRB and County Council Work Session					
Public Comment Ref. #	Topic-Public Comment	Summary of Public Comments/Recommendation	STRRB Ref #	Potential Changes in Policy or Guidance/ Staff Comments	Council Comments
	Cont' Impacts on economy, tourism, etc.	<p>grandfather previously approved with no serious violations or neighborhood disturbances.</p> <p><b>Vanderzon (30)</b> – Family getaway and STR, could not afford without STR. Tourism, service industry impacts.</p> <p><b>Proserpi (33)</b> – Selectively rents home, positive feedback, 2 have purchased in TC, income to tourism, STRs positive asset.</p> <p><b>Stumpf (38)</b> – Ban on STRs would result in loss of revenue to County.</p> <p><b>Price (39)</b> – STRs defray maintenance expenses.</p> <p><b>Otte (42)</b> – Consideration of Comprehensive Plan goals to promote “quality of life” and “resilient communities” when reviewing STR rules.</p> <p><b>Susman (47)</b> – B&amp;B’s and hotels experiencing downturn in occupancy due to STRs. Renters eating in, vs. going out, pay no income tax and do not vote here.</p> <p><b>Stevens (57)</b> – severe restrictions on STRs will mean that the County will miss out on tourism income.</p> <p><b>Steen (58)</b> – Owner neighbors contribute</p>			



STR Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments for 12-18-2019 Joint STRRB and County Council Work Session					
Public Comment Ref. #	Topic-Public Comment	Summary of Public Comments/Recommendation	STRRB Ref #	Potential Changes in Policy or Guidance/ Staff Comments	Council Comments
	Cont' Impacts on economy, tourism, etc.	<p>more to the community than STR guests, cost to displace long term rentals.</p> <p><b>McCafferty (61)</b> – Guests support local businesses and we utilize local services.</p> <p><b>Cox (62)</b> – Regulations damage this part of the economy that provides revenue to the County.</p> <p><b>K Schamel (68)</b>–County has a lack of beds for tourists, especially families and for extended stays, and STRs fill that problem.</p> <p><b>B. Kane (73)</b> – STRs support local economy by employing many service providers, support STRs.</p> <p><b>Marrah (9)</b> – Board not in touch with tourism. Profitable business for Talbot County, homeowners, businesses and needed by tourists.</p> <p><b>Carney (14)</b> – Waterfowl goers, local events.</p> <p><b>Hardesty (15)</b> – Tax revenue to the County, tourism dollars.</p> <p><b>Bogan (82)</b> – STRs “fill the void” when there are no vacancies at hotels and B&amp;Bs.</p>			

STR Revisions and Recommendations Matrix—Public Comments for 12-18-2019 Joint STRRB and County Council Work Session					
Public Comment Ref. #	Topic-Public Comment	Summary of Public Comments/Recommendation	STRRB Ref #	Potential Changes in Policy or Guidance/ Staff Comments	Council Comments
17	<p>Reduce/Eliminate STRs</p> <p>Cont' Reduce/Eliminate STRs</p>	<p><b>Heartfield (22)</b> – Not in neighborhoods, Rio Vista. Parking, noise, music. Article-Orinda Bans Non-Hosted Short Term Rentals.</p> <p><b>Cleveland (59)</b> – Oppose STRs in downtown Easton and neighboring areas (Easton Club, Cooks Hope, etc.) and allow in isolated areas without anyone else nearby.</p> <p><b>Steen (58)</b> – Require all STRs to be occupied by owners during rentals, assure numbers of STRs do not change neighborhoods.</p> <p><b>Jamarik (66)</b> – Keep the number of STRs in each neighborhood “well controlled”.</p> <p><b>Gaffney(79)</b> - Discourage STRs in the County.</p>			
Additional comments received					
1	<b>Judy Geoghegan (8)</b> - Article from California-4 dead in Calif. Halloween party shooting.				
2	<b>Heartfield (22)</b> - Article, Orinda bans non-hosted short-term rentals.				
3	<b>M. Vanderzon(69)</b> - Hire consultant to revamp entire STR licensure and enforcement process				